



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/124,623	07/29/98	MOORE	C NANO-001/13U

COOLEY GODWARD
ATT: PATENT GROUP
FIVE PALO ALTO SQUARE
3000 EL CAMINO REAL
PALO ALTO CA 94306-2155

LM02/0131

EXAMINER

ENG, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2783

DATE MAILED:

01/31/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/124,623

Applicant(s)
Moore et al

Examiner
David Y. Eng

Group Art Unit
2783



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 29, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit:

The abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(1). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

This application which is a continuation of a prior application lacks the necessary reference to the prior application. A statement reading "This is a continuation of Application No. 08/484,918, filed 6/7/95." should be entered following the title of the invention or as the first sentence of the specification. Also, the current status of the parent nonprovisional application(s) should be included.

Claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Scope of the claims is not clear. The claims are dependent on claims which are not in the application.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit:


Claims 1, 4, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards (4,680,698).

See at least claim 2 in Edwards. Edwards discloses a microprocessor integrated circuit comprising a processor and a memory being on the same substrate. Whether or not memory occupies more substrate area than the processor is dependent on whether more memory is desired. No inventive concept is seen by allowing the memory to use more substrate area than the processor.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Bell (5,379,438).

Edwards discloses claim combination set forth above. Edwards did not disclose whether his processor is capable of communicating with another processor. Bell teaches that communication between processor is well known in the art. Figure 7 in Bell shows a coprocessor 184 communicating with host system 182. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to connect another processor to the processor of Edwards such that they can communicate with each other.

For the reason set forth in the section 112 rejection above, no statement can be made as to whether the applied art is applicable to claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-10 and 12-13.



DAVID Y. ENG
PRIMARY EXAMINER